

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/981,213	Applicant(s) RENES ET AL.	
	Examiner Tran Nguyen	Art Unit 3626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tran Nguyen. (3) Allen Turner, Inventor.

(2) Johan Renes, Inventor. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 6,9,12 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Golden.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant described the disclosed invention. Examiner provided clarifications regarding the grounds of rejection, the applied art, and the general state of the art. Agreement was reached to the extent that additional follow-up interviews will be scheduled to review proposed claim amendments to address outstanding issues.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/T. N./ Examiner, Art Unit 3626	
------------------------------------	--